

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

STACY PINCUS, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,,

Plaintiff,

STARBUCKS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

No. 16-cv-04705

Honorable Thomas D. Durkin

Magistrate Judge Young B. Kim

**STARBUCKS CORPORATION'S NOTICE OF  
FILING OF MOTION FOR COORDINATION AND TRANSFER  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTIONS**

Defendant Starbucks Corporation ("Starbucks"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby provides notice that on May 26, 2016 it filed a Motion for Coordination and Transfer ("Transfer Motion") before the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation ("JPML" or "Panel"). *See In re: Starbucks Corporation Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2725.

The Panel accepted the Transfer Motion for filing and issued a briefing schedule on May 27, 2016. Any response to the Motion to Transfer is due by June 17, 2016. Copies of the Motion to Transfer and the Clerk's Notice setting briefing schedule are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

In addition, Starbucks provides notice of the following actions in state court and federal district courts which involve all or a material part of the same subject matter as this case:

<b>Court:</b>	<b>Case Name:</b>	<b>Case Number:</b>	<b>Claims for Relief:</b>
U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California	<i>Strumlauf v. Starbucks Corporation</i>	3:16-cv-1306 TEH	(1) Breach of Express Warranty; (2) Breach Implied Warranty of Merchantability; (3) Unjust Enrichment; (4) Violation of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"); (5) Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"); (6) Violation of California's False Advertising Law ("FAL"); (7) Negligent Misrepresentation; and (8) Fraud
U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York	<i>Brittany Crittenden v. Starbucks Corporation</i>	1:16-cv-03496	(1) Breach of Warranty; (2) Violations of New York General Business Law § 349; (3) Violations of New York General Business Law § 350; (4) Fraudulent Concealment/Fraudulent Inducement; (5) Negligent Misrepresentation; and (6) Unjust Enrichment
Los Angeles Superior Court	<i>Alexander Forouzesht v. Starbucks Corporation</i>	BC621572	(1) Breach of Express Warranty; (2) Breach of the Implied Warranty of Merchantability; (3) Negligent Representation; (4) Unjust Enrichment; (5) Fraud; (6) Violation of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"); (7) Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law; and (8) Violation of California's False Advertising Law

DATED: May 27, 2016

**SHEPPARD MULLIN  
RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP**

By: /s/ David S. Almeida

David S. Almeida (ARDC #6285557)  
dalmeida@sheppardmullin.com  
**SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP**  
70 West Madison Street, 48th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Telephone: (312) 499-6300  
Facsimile: (312) 499-6301

*Counsel for Starbucks Corporation*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **STARBUCKS CORPORATION'S NOTICE OF FILING OF MOTION FOR COORDINATION AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTIONS** was served upon all interested parties using this Court's ECF filing system this 27th day of May, 2016.

/s/ David S. Almeida